

whoever is running and funding the ad would have to appear in the advertisement and claim responsibility for it, like a company's CEO or an organization's biggest contributor. This will mean citizens can evaluate the claims in these ads with information about an organization's real motives.

We know how important this is. We've all seen groups with benign-seeming names sponsoring television commercials that make accusations and assertions designed to influence the public debate and sway voters' minds. Now, of course every organization has every right in this country to make their voices heard. But the American people also have the right to know when some group like "Citizens for a Better Future" is actually funded entirely by "Corporations for Weaker Oversight."

In addition, these reforms would address another troubling aspect of the Supreme Court's ruling. Under the bill Congress will consider, we'll make sure that foreign corporations and foreign nationals are restricted from spending money to influence American elections, just as they were in the past, even through U.S. subsidiaries. And we'll keep large contractors that receive taxpayer funds from interfering in our

elections as well to avoid the appearance of corruption and the possible misuse of tax dollars.

Now, we can expect that these proposed changes will be met with heavy resistance from the special interests and their supporters in Congress. But I'm calling on leaders in both parties to resist these pressures. For what we are facing is no less than a potential corporate takeover of our elections. And what is at stake is no less than the integrity of our democracy. This shouldn't be a Democratic issue or a Republican issue. This is an issue that goes to whether or not we will have a Government that works for ordinary Americans, a Government of, by, and for the people. That's why these reforms are so important. And that's why I'm going to fight to see them passed into law.

Thanks so much.

NOTE: The address was recorded at approximately 6:10 p.m. on April 29 in the Red Room at the White House for broadcast on May 1. The transcript was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 30, but was embargoed for release until 6 a.m. on May 1. The Office of the Press Secretary also released a Spanish language transcript of this address.

## Commencement Address at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, Michigan May 1, 2010

*The President.* Thank you, everybody. Please be seated.

*Audience member.* We love you!

*The President.* Oh, I love you back. [Laughter]

It is great to be here in the Big House—[applause]—and so may I say, "Go Blue!" [Applause] I thought I'd go for the cheap applause line to start things off. [Laughter]

Good afternoon, President Coleman, the board of trustees, to faculty, parents, family, and friends of the class of 2010. Congratulations on your graduation, and thank you for allowing me the honor of being a part of it. Let me acknowledge your wonderful Governor, Jennifer Granholm, your mayor, John Hieftje, and all the Members of Congress who are here today.

It is a privilege to be with you on this happy occasion, and you know, it's nice to spend a little time outside of Washington. [Laughter] Now, don't get me wrong, Washington is a beautiful city. It's very nice living above the store; you can't beat the commute. [Laughter] It's just, sometimes, all you hear in Washington is the clamor of politics. And all that noise can drown out the voices of the people who sent you there. So when I took office, I decided that each night I would read 10 letters out of the tens of thousands that are sent to us by ordinary Americans every day. This is my modest effort to remind myself of why I ran in the first place.

Some of these letters tell stories of heartache and struggle. Some express gratitude, some express anger. I'd say a good solid third call me an

idiot, which is how I know that I'm getting a good, representative sample. *[Laughter]* Some of the letters make you think, like the one that I received last month from a kindergarten class in Virginia.

Now, the teacher of this class instructed the students to ask me any question they wanted. So one asked, "How do you do your job?" Another asked, "Do you work a lot?" *[Laughter]* Somebody wanted to know if I wear a black jacket or if I have a beard, so clearly they were getting me mixed up with the other tall guy from Illinois. *[Laughter]* And one of my favorites was from a kid who wanted to know if I lived next to a volcano. *[Laughter]* I'm still trying to piece the thought process on this one. *[Laughter]* Loved this letter. But it was the last question from the last student in the letter that gave me pause. The student asked, "Are people being nice?" Are people being nice?

Well, if you turn on the news today or yesterday or a week ago or a month ago, particularly one of the cable channels, you can see—*[laughter]*—you can see why even a kindergartener would ask this question. *[Laughter]* We've got politicians calling each other all sorts of unflattering names. Pundits and talking heads shout at each other. The media tends to play up every hint of conflict because it makes for a sexier story, which means anyone interested in getting coverage feels compelled to make their arguments as outrageous and as incendiary as possible.

Now, some of this contentiousness can be attributed to the incredibly difficult moment in which we find ourselves as a nation. The fact is, when you leave here today, you will search for work in an economy that is still emerging from the worst crisis since the Great Depression. You live in a century where the speed with which jobs and industries move across the globe is forcing America to compete like never before. You will raise your children at a time when threats like terrorism and climate change aren't confined within the borders of any one country. And as our world grows smaller and more connected, you will live and work with more people who don't look like you or think like you or come from where you do.

I really enjoyed Alex's remarks, because that's a lot of change. And all these changes, all these challenges inevitably cause some tension in the body politic. They make people worry about the future, and sometimes they get people riled up.

But I think it's important that we maintain some historic perspective. Since the days of our founding, American politics has never been a particularly nice business. It's always been a little less genteel during times of great change. A newspaper of the opposing party once editorialized that if Thomas Jefferson were elected, "Murder, robbery, rape, adultery, and incest will be openly taught and practiced." *[Laughter]* Not subtle. Opponents of Andrew Jackson often referred to his mother as a "common prostitute," which seems a little over the top. *[Laughter]* Presidents from Teddy Roosevelt to Lyndon Johnson have been accused of promoting socialism or worse. And we've had arguments between politicians that have been settled with actual duels. There was even a caning once on the floor of the United States Senate, which I'm happy to say didn't happen while I was there. *[Laughter]* It was a few years before. *[Laughter]*

The point is, politics has never been for the thinskinners or the faint of heart, and if you enter the arena, you should expect to get roughed up. Moreover, democracy in a nation of more than 300 million people is inherently difficult. It's always been noisy and messy, contentious, complicated. We've been fighting about the proper size and role of Government since the days the Framers gathered in Philadelphia. We've battled over the meaning of individual freedom and equality since the Bill of Rights was drafted. As our economy has shifted emphasis from agriculture to industry to information to technology, we have argued and struggled at each and every juncture over the best way to ensure that all of our citizens have a shot at opportunity.

So before we get too depressed about the current state of our politics, let's remember our history. The great debates of the past all stirred great passions. They all made somebody angry and at least once led to a terrible war. What is amazing is that despite all the

conflict, despite all its flaws and its frustrations, our experiment in democracy has worked better than any form of government on Earth.

On the last day of the Constitutional Convention, Benjamin Franklin was famously asked, "Well, Doctor, what have we got, a republic or a monarchy?" And Franklin gave an answer that's been quoted for ages. He said, "A republic, if you can keep it." If you can keep it.

Well, for more than 200 years, we have kept it. Through revolution and civil war, our democracy has survived. Through depression and world war, it has prevailed. Through periods of great social and economic unrest, from civil rights to women's rights, it has allowed us slowly, sometimes painfully, to move towards a more perfect Union.

And so now, class of 2010, the question for your generation is this: How will you keep our democracy going? At a moment when our challenges seem so big and our politics seem so small, how will you keep our democracy alive and vibrant? How will you keep it well in this century?

Now, I'm not here to offer some grand theory or detailed policy prescription. But let me offer a few brief reflections based on my own experiences and the experiences of our country over the last two centuries.

First of all, American democracy has thrived because we have recognized the need for a Government that, while limited, can still help us adapt to a changing world. On the fourth panel of the Jefferson Memorial is a quote I remember reading to my daughters during our first visit there. It says, "I am not an advocate for frequent changes in laws and constitutions, but . . . with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times."

The democracy designed by Jefferson and the other Founders was never intended to solve every problem with a new law or a new program. Having thrown off the tyranny of the British Empire, the first Americans were understandably skeptical of government. And ever since, we've held fast to the belief that government doesn't have all the answers, and we have cherished and fiercely defended our individual freedom. That's a strand of our Nation's DNA.

But the other strand is the belief that there are some things we can only do together, as one Nation, and that our Government must keep pace with the times. When America expanded from a few colonies to an entire continent and we needed a way to reach the Pacific, our Government helped build the railroads. When we transitioned from an economy based on farms to one based on factories and workers needed new skills and training, our Nation set up a system of public high schools. When the markets crashed during the Depression and people lost their life savings, our Government put in place a set of rules and safeguards to make sure that such a crisis never happened again, and then put a safety net in place to make sure that our elders would never be impoverished the way they had been. And because our markets and financial systems have evolved since then, we're now putting in place new rules and safeguards to protect the American people.

Now, this notion, class, hasn't always been partisan. It was the first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, who said the role of government is to do for the people what they cannot do better for themselves. And he'd go on to begin that first intercontinental railroad and set up the first land-grant colleges. It was another Republican, Teddy Roosevelt, who said, "The object of government is the welfare of the people." And he's remembered for using the power of Government to break up monopolies and establish our National Park System. Democrat Lyndon Johnson announced the Great Society during a commencement here at Michigan, but it was the Republican President before him, Dwight Eisenhower, who launched the massive Government undertaking known as the Interstate Highway System.

Of course, there have always been those who've opposed such efforts. They argue government intervention is usually inefficient, that it restricts individual freedom and dampens individual initiative. And in certain instances, that's been true. For many years, we had a welfare system that too often discouraged people from taking responsibility for their own upward mobility. At times, we've neglected the role of parents, rather than government, in cultivating a child's education. And sometimes regulations

fail, and sometimes their benefits don't justify their costs.

But what troubles me is when I hear people say that all of government is inherently bad. One of my favorite signs during the health care debate was somebody who said, "Keep Your Government Hands Out Of My Medicare"—[*laughter*]*—*which is essentially saying, "Keep Government Out Of My Government-Run Health Care Plan." [*Laughter*]

When our Government is spoken of as some menacing, threatening foreign entity, it ignores the fact that in our democracy, Government is us. We, the people, hold our—[*applause*]*—*we, the people, hold in our hands the power to choose our leaders and change our laws and shape our own destiny.

Government's the police officers who are protecting our communities and the service men and women who are defending us abroad. Government is the roads you drove in on and the speed limits that kept you safe. Government is what ensures that mines adhere to safety standards and that oil spills are cleaned up by the companies that caused them. Government is this extraordinary public university, a place that's doing lifesaving research and catalyzing economic growth and graduating students who will change the world around them in ways big and small.

The truth is, the debate we've had for decades now between more government and less government, it doesn't really fit the times in which we live. We know that too much government can stifle competition and deprive us of choice and burden us with debt. But we've also clearly seen the dangers of too little government, like when a lack of accountability on Wall Street nearly leads to the collapse of our entire economy.

So, class of 2010, what we should be asking is not whether we need "big government" or a "small government," but how we can create a smarter and better government. Because in an era of iPods and TiVo, where we have more choices than ever before—even though I can't really work a lot of these things—[*laughter*]*—*but I have 23-year-olds who do it for me—[*laughter*]*—*government shouldn't try to dictate your lives, but it should give you the

tools you need to succeed. Government shouldn't try to guarantee results, but it should guarantee a shot at opportunity for every American who's willing to work hard.

So yes, we can and should debate the role of government in our lives. But remember, as you are asked to meet the challenges of our time, remember that the ability for us to adapt our Government to the needs of the age has helped make our democracy work since its inception.

Now, the second way to keep our democracy healthy is to maintain a basic level of civility in our public debate. These arguments we're having over government and health care and war and taxes, these are serious arguments. They should arouse people's passions, and it's important for everybody to join in the debate with all the vigor that the maintenance of a free people requires.

But we can't expect to solve our problems if all we do is tear each other down. You can disagree with a certain policy without demonizing the person who espouses it. You can question somebody's views and their judgment without questioning their motives or their patriotism. Throwing around phrases like "socialists" and "Soviet-style takeover" and "fascist" and "rightwing nut"—[*laughter*]*—*that may grab headlines, but it also has the effect of comparing our Government, our political opponents, to authoritarian, even murderous regimes.

Now, we've seen this kind of politics in the past. It's been practiced by both fringes of the ideological spectrum, by the left and the right, since our Nation's birth. But it's starting to creep into the center of our discourse. And the problem with it is not the hurt feelings or the bruised egos of the public officials who are criticized. Remember, they signed up for it. Michelle always reminds me of that. [*Laughter*] The problem is that this kind of vilification and over-the-top rhetoric closes the door to the possibility of compromise. It undermines democratic deliberation. It prevents learning, since, after all, why should we listen to a "fascist" or a "socialist" or a "rightwing nut" or a "leftwing nut"? [*Laughter*]

It makes it nearly impossible for people who have legitimate but bridgeable differences to

sit down at the same table and hash things out. It robs us of a rational and serious debate, the one we need to have about the very real and very big challenges facing this Nation. It coarsens our culture, and at its worst, it can send signals to the most extreme elements of our society that perhaps violence is a justifiable response.

So what do we do? As I found out after a year in the White House, changing this type of politics is not easy. And part of what civility requires is that we recall the simple lesson most of us learned from our parents: Treat others as you would like to be treated, with courtesy and respect. But civility in this age also requires something more than just asking if we can't just all get along.

Today's 24/7 echo chamber amplifies the most inflammatory sound bites louder and faster than ever before. And it's also, however, given us unprecedented choice. Whereas most Americans used to get their news from the same three networks over dinner or a few influential papers on Sunday morning, we now have the option to get our information from any number of blogs or web sites or cable news shows. And this can have both a good and bad development for democracy. For if we choose only to expose ourselves to opinions and viewpoints that are in line with our own, studies suggest that we become more polarized, more set in our ways. That will only reinforce and even deepen the political divides in this country.

But if we choose to actively seek out information that challenges our assumptions and our beliefs, perhaps we can begin to understand where the people who disagree with us are coming from.

Now, this requires us to agree on a certain set of facts to debate from. That's why we need a vibrant and thriving news business that is separate from opinion makers and talking heads. That's why we need an educated citizenry that values hard evidence and not just assertion. As Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan famously once said, "Everybody is entitled to his own opinion, but not his own facts." [*Laughter*]

Still, if you're somebody who only reads the editorial page of the New York Times, try glancing at the page of the Wall Street Journal once

in a while. If you're a fan of Glenn Beck or Rush Limbaugh, try reading a few columns on the Huffington Post web site. It may make your blood boil, your mind may not be changed, but the practice of listening to opposing views is essential for effective citizenship. It is essential for our democracy.

And so too is the practice of engaging in different experiences with different kinds of people. I look out at this class, and I realize, for 4 years at Michigan, you have been exposed to diverse thinkers and scholars, professors and students. Don't narrow that broad intellectual exposure just because you're leaving here. Instead, seek to expand it. If you grew up in a big city, spend some time with somebody who grew up in a rural town. If you find yourself only hanging around with people of your own race or ethnicity or religion, include people in your circle who have different backgrounds and life experiences. You'll learn what it's like to walk in somebody else's shoes, and in the process, you will help to make this democracy work.

Which brings me to the last ingredient in a functioning democracy, one that's perhaps most basic and has already been mentioned, and that is participation.

Class of 2010, I understand that one effect of today's poisonous political climate is to push people away from participation in public life. If all you see when you turn on the TV is name-calling, if all you hear about is how special interest lobbying and partisanship prevented Washington from getting something done, then you might think to yourself, what's the point of getting involved?

Here's the point: When we don't pay close attention to the decisions made by our leaders, when we fail to educate ourselves about the major issues of the day, when we choose not to make our voices and opinions heard, that's when democracy breaks down. That's when power is abused. That's when the most extreme voices in our society fill the void that we leave. That's when powerful interests and their lobbyists are most able to buy access and influence in the corridors of power, because none of us are there to speak up and stop them.

Participation in public life doesn't mean that you all have to run for public office, though we

could certainly use some fresh faces in Washington. *[Laughter]* But it does mean that you should pay attention and contribute in any way that you can. Stay informed. Write letters or make phone calls on behalf of an issue that you care about. If electoral politics isn't your thing, continue the tradition so many of you started here at Michigan, and find a way to serve your community and your country, an act that will help you stay connected to your fellow citizens and improve the lives of those around you.

You know, it was 50 years ago that a young candidate for President came here to Michigan and delivered a speech that inspired one of the most successful service projects in American history. And as John F. Kennedy described the ideals behind what would become the Peace Corps, he issued a challenge to the students who had assembled in Ann Arbor on that October night: "On your willingness to contribute part of your life to this country," he said, "will depend the answer whether a free society can compete. I think it can," he said.

This democracy we have is a precious thing. For all the arguments and all the doubts and all the cynicism that's out there today, we should never forget that as Americans, we enjoy more freedoms and opportunities than citizens in any other nation on Earth. We are free to speak our mind and worship as we please. We are free to choose our leaders and criticize them if they let us down. We have the chance to get an education and work hard and give our children a better life.

None of this came easy. None of this was preordained. The men and women who sat in your chairs 10 years ago and 50 years ago and 100 years ago, they made America possible

through their toil and their endurance and their imagination and their faith. Their success and America's success was never a given. And there is no guarantee that the graduates who will sit in these same seats 10 years from now or 50 years from now or 100 years from now will enjoy the same freedoms and opportunities that you do. You too will have to strive. You too will have to push the boundaries of what seems possible. For the truth is, our Nation's destiny has never been certain.

What is certain, what has always been certain, is the ability to shape that destiny. That is what makes us different. That is what sets us apart. That is what makes us Americans, our ability at the end of the day to look past all our differences and all of our disagreements and still forge a common future. And that task is now in your hands, as is the answer to the question posed at this university half a century ago about whether a free society can still compete.

If you are willing, as past generations were willing, to contribute part of your life to the life of this country, then I, like President Kennedy, believe we can, because I believe in you.

Congratulations on your graduation, 2010. May God bless you, and may God bless the United States of America. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:40 a.m. at Michigan Stadium. In his remarks, he referred to Mary Sue Coleman, president, and Alexander W. Marston, 2010 bachelor of arts graduate and student speaker, University of Michigan; and political commentators Glenn Beck and Rush Limbaugh.

## Remarks at the White House Correspondents' Association Dinner May 1, 2010

*The President.* Thank you so much, Ed. And to all the other board members, to honored guests, and to the lovely First Lady, good evening.

Ed is right, I work a lot. And so I wasn't sure that I should actually come tonight. Biden talked me into it. *[Laughter]* He leaned over,

and he said, "Mr. President, this is no ordinary dinner." *[Laughter]* "This is a big—*[electronic beep]*—ing meal."

It's been quite a year since I've spoken here last, lots of ups, lots of downs, except for my approval ratings, which have just gone down. *[Laughter]* But that's politics. It doesn't bother